

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and claim 15 are amended. Support for these amendments can be found, *e.g.*, at p. 4 lines 21-23 (“[t]he user interface control element relates to the appearance and operability of a user interface for handling a business object, such as which fields are/are not open for user input”); p. 5 line 28-p. 6 line 2 (“[o]perations by the configuration software may include presenting a user . . . with a number of configuration options [such as] to define what activities constitute a business process”); p. 6 lines 4-6 (“[t]he configuration software may further present the user with the option to define, for each activity of a business process, how the activity is to behave with respect to a business object for each of the process control elements”); p. 6 lines 13-14 (“[f]or the user interface element, the user may be enabled to specify what fields of a user interface for manipulating the object may be filled in or modified”); p. 6 lines 20-22 (“[f]or the user interface control element, the user might enable/disable particular fields of a user interface for manipulating object A pursuant to activity 2”). No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 based on the foregoing amendments and the remarks below.

CLAIMS 1-15 DEFINE OVER KASSEM

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kassem et al. (*Designing Enterprise Applications with the Java® 2 Platform, Enterprise Edition*) (“Kassem”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The present application relates to software that creates a generic framework for the definition of business processes. Independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 each specify that the process control elements define the behavior of a business process activity with respect to a business object. In contrast, Kassem simply discloses an architecture wherein business objects are accessed and manipulated “according to the business rules.” Kassem at § 3.2. Thus, Kassem does not disclose how business rules or processes are generated in response to user specifications.

Claims 1-2 Define Over the Cited Art.

Consider claim 1, which recites:

- (i) *querying a user to identify*, via configuration software of a computer system, activities that make up a business process;
- (ii) for each activity identified in step (i), *querying the user to provide process control elements* that define a behavior of the respective activity of the business process with respect to a business object to be acted on by the activity, said process control elements including . . .
- (iv) dynamically generating the business process *from the activities and the process control elements provided by the user*, to operate on business objects managed by the computer system.

Claim 1 defines a method that allows a user to define a business process by answering queries provided to it by a software application and dynamically generates a business process from this user provided information. It avoids, for example, the tedium and expense formerly required by manual definitions of business processes.

With respect to claim 1, Kassem does not teach configuration software through which a *user may identify activities* that make up the business process. Likewise, Kassem does not teach *querying the user* to provide process control elements.

Moreover, Kassem does not teach the requisite process control elements that *define a business activity behavior*, which activity in turn acts on a business object managed by the computer system. For example, with respect to claim 1, the Office Action cites Kassem at § 2.5.4.1 as disclosing a status element; however, that section teaches tracking enterprise progress through the *exchange of messages*. Similarly, Kassem at § 1.2.1, p. 25 ¶ 2, and § 2.1.2 simply teaches the user interface of an *application*, not a user-defined scope within which users may operate on the business object. Moreover, the Model disclosed by Kassem at § 1.3.5 and the EJB tier described at § 3.2 disclose *architectural* guidelines, not a user-defined plausibility check element of a business process activity. Likewise, the transactions disclosed in Kassem at § 2.3.3 simply divide an application into units of work; thus, Kassem does not teach a user-defined release element that signals whether the business object may proceed past the instant business process activity. In fact, to the contrary,

Kassem at § 2.3.3 explicitly teaches that a unit *is committed* if it *can be completed* in its entirety; no user-specified “release” is required. Lastly, Kassem at § 2.3.4 teaches only that the system determines authorization to access a resource based on security policies; it does not teach a *user-specified* process control element that *defines* a behavior of the business process activity.

Finally, Kassem fails to teach *dynamically generating* the business process *from the activities and the process control elements provided by the user*, to operate on business objects managed by the computer system. The Office Action cites §§ 7.3, 1.2.2.1 and 6.3 as disclosing these limitations; however, these sections fall far short of the requisite disclosure. For example, whereas the business process activities defined by the present invention operate on business objects, § 7.3 specifically teaches that deployment descriptors do *not* tell the server how to manage components. Similarly, Kassem at § 1.2.2.1 teaches that standard services in the runtime environment allow dynamic connection between components; he does *not* teach dynamically generating the business process based on user input. Finally, § 6.3 teaches only how JDBC 2.0 API accesses relational databases to manage *persistent* data; this section teaches nothing about dynamically generating a business process from the activities and process control elements provided by the user.

Claims 3-6 Define Over the Cited Art.

Claims 3-6 also stand rejected as anticipated by Kassem. Independent claim 3 recites:

A computer system comprising . . . a memory coupled to [a] processor and storing instructions . . . implementing a method including:

querying a user to identify, via configuration software, activities that make up a business process;

for each identified activity, *querying the user to provide process control elements* that define a behavior of the respective activity of the business process with respect to a business object to be acted on by the activity, said process control elements including . . .

dynamically generating the business process *from the activities and the process control elements provided by the user*, to operate on business objects managed by the computer system.

As discussed above, Kassem fails to teach or suggest this subject matter. Kassem simply discloses an architecture wherein business objects are accessed and manipulated “according to the business

rules.” Kassem at § 3.2. Thus, Kassem does not disclose how business rules or processes are dynamically generated in response to user specifications. Accordingly, claims 3-6 are allowable over Kassem.

Claims 7-8 Define Over the Cited Art.

Claims 7-8 also stand rejected as anticipated by Kassem. Independent claim 7 recites:

A machine-readable storage medium storing . . . instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method including:

querying a user to identify, via configuration software, activities that make up a business process;

for each identified activity, *querying the user to provide process control elements* that define a behavior of the respective activity of the business process with respect to a business object to be acted on by the activity, said process control elements including . . .

dynamically generating the business process *from the activities and the process control elements provided by the user*, to operate on business objects managed by the computer system.

As discussed above, Kassem fails to teach or suggest this subject matter. Kassem simply discloses an architecture wherein business objects are accessed and manipulated “according to the business rules.” Kassem at § 3.2. Thus, Kassem does not disclose how business rules or processes are dynamically generated in response to user specifications. Accordingly, claims 7-8 are allowable over Kassem.

Claims 9-15 Define Over the Cited Art.

Claims 9-15 also stand rejected as anticipated by Kassem. Independent claim 9 recites:

reading configuration data to determine a behavior of a *user-identified* activity of a business process with respect to a business object to be acted on by the activity, wherein *user-provided* process control elements define the behavior stored in the configuration data, said process control elements including . . .

As discussed above, Kassem fails to teach or suggest this subject matter. Kassem simply discloses an architecture wherein business objects are accessed and manipulated “according to the business

rules.” Kassem at § 3.2. Thus, Kassem does not disclose how business rules or processes are generated in response to user specifications. Accordingly, claims 9-15 are allowable over Kassem.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

All claims are allowable. Applicants respectfully request a notice to that effect.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201

/ Robert L. Hails, Jr/

Robert L. Hails, Jr.

Registration No. 39,702